The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
29 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. I
No. 5

SEPTEMBER
1912

The Enemy At The Gate
(By Max G. Schlapp)

Woman Suffrage a Mistaken Theory of Progress

Reasons for Opposing Woman Suffrage

Social Welfare and Suffrage

Ohio Votes Defeat Suffrage Amendment

Subscription, $1.00 a Year **Single copies, 10 cents**

Entered as second-class matter May 1, 1912, at the postoffice at New York, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

29 West 39th Street, New York City

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.

Secretary, Mrs. Morgan G. Bulkeley, Hartford, Conn.

Treasurer, Mrs. Robert Garrett, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.
Mrs. William A. Putnam, New York.
Mrs. C. F. Corbin, Chicago, Ill.
Mrs. J. F. Bailey, Portland, Oregon.
Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. Frank Goodwin, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Herman M. Hubbard, Columbus, O.
Miss Anna Dayton, Trenton, N. J.
Miss Jane U. Rutherford, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. Edson J. Hill, New Hampshire.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT.

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.

Vice-Presidents, Miss Elizabeth Burnell, Mrs. Charles C. Beach, Miss Martha J. Wilkinson.

Treasurer, Mrs. Albert S. Cook.

Secretary, Mrs. John L. Bunce, 45 Sumner Street, Hartford.

ILLINOIS.

President, Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. S. M. Nickerson, Mrs. R. J. Oglesby, Mrs. James M. Walker, Mrs. T. B. Blackstone.

Treasurer, Miss J. C. Fairfield, Dearborn Avenue, Chicago.

Recording Secretary, Mrs. George W. Kretzinger.

IOWA COMMITTEE.

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.

Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MAINE COMMITTEE.

Secretary, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland; Mrs. Charles S. Ogden, Mrs. James P. Baxter, Mrs. Clarence H. Corning, Mrs. F. A. Quimby, Miss Louisa Spring, Miss Catherine P. Talbot, Miss Hannah L. Talbot, Miss Mary King Longfellow, Miss Elinor S. Moody, Miss Marion Richmond Weeks, Mrs. John M. Glidden, Newcastle; Mrs. P. M. Blake, Bangor; Mrs. F. C. Robinson, Brunswick.

MARYLAND.

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Haslup Adams, Mrs. Arthur B. Kinsolving, Miss Catharine M. Selfe.

Corresponding Secretary, Miss Katherine F. Davis.

Recording Secretary, Mrs. Claude Hall.

Treasurer, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose.

MASSACHUSETTS.

President, Miss Mary S. Ames.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.

Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman.

Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson.

Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Room 615 Kensington Building, Boyleston Street, Boston.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ASSOCIATION.

President, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas C. Bethume, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.

Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.

Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, Concord.

Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY.

President, Miss Anna Dayton.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Grover Cleveland, Princeton; Mrs. Thomas Craven, Salem.

Secretary, Miss Fanny Dickinson.

Treasurer, Mrs. Charles Minnegorode, 192 West State Street, Trenton.

NEW YORK STATE.

President, Mrs William A. Putnam.

First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.

Vice-Presidents, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.

Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.

Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis, 29 West 39th St.

Treasurer, Mrs. Charlton T. Lewis.

OHIO.

President, Mrs. Hermon M. Hubbard.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Joseph Crane, Dayton; Mrs. W. W. Clippinger, Madisonville; Mrs. John M. Gundry, Cleveland; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. Frank Ray, Granville; Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton.

Mrs. Lyman Arms, president, Columbus Auxiliary.

Mrs. H. E. Talbott, president, Dayton Auxiliary.

Dr. Anna Preston, president, Marietta Auxiliary.

Mrs. Warner J. Pond, president, Granville Auxiliary.

Treasurer, Miss Alice B. Haney.

Secretary, Miss F. Ewing Martin, Room 332 Chamber of Commerce Building, Columbus, O.

OREGON.

President, Mrs. Francis J. Bailey, Bowers Hotel, Portland.

Vice-Presidents, Miss Failing, Mrs. R. W. Wilbur.

Treasurer, Mrs. Wallace McCamant.

Secretary, Miss Eleanor E. Gile.

PENNSYLVANIA.

President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Frank Samuel, Mrs. William W. Birdsall, Miss Sophy D. Irwin, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. William L. McLean, Miss Mary Newhall.

Treasurer, Miss Elise Balch.

Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Brinton Coxe, 1515 Spruce Street, Philadelphia.

Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.

RHODE ISLAND.

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.

Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha Howard.

Secretary, Mrs. Albert Harkness.

VIRGINIA.

President, Miss Jane M. Rutherford.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas Cary Johnson, Mrs. Charles Whitlock, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. Arthur Wilmer.

Secretary, Mrs. Charles M. Ferrell, 1616 Grove Avenue, Richmond.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

President, Mrs. Frank Goodwin.

Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Miss Jane Riggs, Miss Mollie Elliot Seawell, Mrs. George Wickersham, Miss Grace Denio Litchfield.

Treasurer, Miss McMullen.

Secretary, Mrs. Kingsbury Waterman, 1311 New Hampshire Avenue.

WISCONSIN.

Madison Branch.

President, Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt.

Treasurer, Mrs. Joseph W. Hobbins.

Secretary, Miss G. M. Mills, 222 Monona Avenue, Madison.

THE WOMAN WITH THE HOE.

BY FLORENCE GOFF SCHWARZ.

The Suffragist Daughter of the Man with the Hoe—Confessing a Certain Indebtedness to Markham.

Bowed by the weight of centuries she stands
On public square and argues and descants,
The emptiness of ages in her face,
And on her back a nifty tailored suit.
What brought this maid to such aggressive task?
What fickle lover hath her trust betrayed,
That she in anger takes the cudgels up
Against mankind in favor of her sex?
Is this the creature that the Lord hath made
To be man's helpmate, angel of his home,
Who stalks forth like a termagant to gain
Scornful attention from a jeering crowd?

Oh, shades of Andrew Jackson, long at rest!
Could you but reckon with this modern dame,
Who glibly prates of Lincoln and of law
In voice that rivals all the megaphones,
Methinks you would not tolerate the creeds
Which set at naught the solid truths of old;
This new progressive born of petticoats
Who seeks to rule a blood-bought hallowed soil
With boldness oozing out of every pore,
Sans gentleness, sans love, sans everything
That makes a woman best revered by man.

Methinks that all the heroes of the past,
Soldiers and statesmen who have given life,
Brain, brawn and blood to make our land the best,
Would swift turn over in their graves to see
The crown of Womanhood dragged in the dust,
Down trampled by a palpitating herd;
To hear words flow in sound devoid of sense,
Mock wisdom that is purely tommyrot
And fraught with menace to the universe;
Methinks grave voices from the past would gasp,
"Was it for this that we have fought and died?"

SOCIALIST-SUFFRAGIST PARADE.

From the New York Times, July 18th.

Asked by "The Times" what were the impelling motives for the organization of a parade of men by the Men's League for Woman Suffrage, to be held in this city on November 9th next, following the Presidential election, Secretary Max Eastman responds:

"Your editorial references would help us more if you would oppose the real reasons we have for advocating woman suffrage. Therefore, I venture to send you a pamphlet, of which we have sold about 12,000 copies, and which I used as a sort of statement of faith in organizing the Men's League for Woman Suffrage."

The Men's League in its pamphlet, "Is Woman Suffrage Important?' clears the field for two arguments, which, it says, have a "vital thrust in them," by saying that "we do not look to women's votes for the purification and moral elevation of the body politic." It is assured, however, that they "will not do any permanent appreciable harm." Moreover, the league will not ignore the fact that women are different from men, and inherit "a body of passionate interests that men only partially share."

That those passionate interests "are needed in government" is the foundation principle of the Men's League for Woman Suffrage. It freely admits that the interests are those of Socialism:

"The growth of the Socialist vote means that enthusiastic people believe that the best intellects of the nation ought to be concentrated in legislative debate upon the problem of securing to all its citizens an opportunity for economic well-being. Yet there are many besides Socialists who urge and expect this change in the centre of governmental interests. Many besides Socialists are ready to do all in their power to focus political attention upon the true issues of advancing civilization."

But what has this to do with votes for women? This, briefly:

We have the opinions of hundreds of good men, in those States and nations where women vote, to support our reasonable expectation that their influence will favor rather than retard this achievement.

Socialists and "many besides Socialists, who urge and expect this change," will make up the rank and file of the suffragist parade next November. It is not just now necessary for us to oppose the "real reasons" for the agitation by the Men's League. We are content with stating them from its official pamphlet.

THE SUFFRAGETTES' FINISH.

"They've ruined their cause nah, Albert. They've lorst MY sympafy, I've DONE wi' wimmin!"—*From Punch.*

PILLAR BOX OUTRAGES.

A number of letters were found destroyed in a pillar-box in Liverpool on Saturday by some black fluid being poured into the slot. The police attribute this outrage as well as some recent attempts to set fire to the contents of pillar-boxes, to suffragists.—Daily Mail (London), July 16th.

A KINDLY WILL.

Mr. Trower, of Weybridge, England, in a will containing many legacies left the residue of his property to his wife for life, and on her death he bequeathed ten thousand pounds to trustees to form a "Woman's Aid Fund," for medical care and the nursing of married or unmarried women in maternity cases. He said in his will:

"I am sincerely desirous that some of the money I may leave behind me should do women some little good, and if it suffices to some extent to soothe a moral pain and dry a few bitter tears, the money will not have been earned by me entirely in vain."—Daily Mail (London), July 11th.

The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

29 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge - - - New York
Secretary, Mrs. Morgan G. Bulkeley - Hartford, Conn.
Treasurer, Mrs. Robert Garrett - Roland Park, Baltimore

Vol. 1 SEPTEMBER, 1912 No. 5

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

SUFFRAGISTS AND THE CAMPAIGN.

THE action of the Progressive Party in putting a Woman Suffrage plank in its platform has provoked much discussion and comment. It was thought at first that by this step the influence of women in the suffrage States, and of suffragists in States where women cannot vote for President, would be used for the new party. Mrs. Alice Stone Blackwell and Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, in long letters to the New York Times, have stated that the National Woman's Suffrage Association always has been and is non-partisan, and that no matter what may be done by individual suffragists, the association will not take any action toward influencing woman suffragists throughout the country. This is official, but leading suffragists have made public statements during the past year that any party having a suffrage plank would have the support of most of the suffragists, ignoring the Socialist and Prohibition parties, which have had suffrage in their platforms for years.

Partisanship seems to be stronger than suffrage in many quarters, however, for there are Roosevelt and Taft clubs in California organized by women. Mrs. Helen Boswell has started a Taft association in New York. Mrs. J. Borden Harriman and Mrs. Archibald Alexander, both suffragists, have organized a woman's association for Wilson.

President Taft refuses to make any statement regarding his opinion of woman suffrage. Mr. Wilson says he is "thinking on the subject," which seems to satisfy the women who are working for him.

We print elsewhere a letter from Miss Jane Addams regarding the difference between a paragraph in Col. Roosevelt's speech at Chicago and the printed report of it. We are assured that Col. Roosevelt has never changed the opinions on woman suffrage as expressed in the article which he wrote on the subject in the Outlook last Winter. As to a referendum to the women of each State for decision on the question of suffrage, the associations opposed to woman suffrage have always favored it, they insisting that a majority of women who are of voting age must favor it, not a majority of those who cast their vote. The suffrage organizations have always opposed this method of settling the question, stating that it would be unconstitutional. One great objection is the expense involved, which in New York State has been estimated at $3,000,000 for special registration and election.

MISSING THEIR OPPORTUNITIES.

MISS HARRIET MAY MILLS has made the announcement that the suffragists have already raised half a million and that before the Winter is over expect to double that amount for suffrage work.

It has been stated that the suffrage parade planned for November (some say to celebrate the victory of the Progressive party) will be the finest yet, and will cost $100,000. One wonders if these large sums would not accomplish more if devoted to the suppression of child labor, improving tenement-house conditions and aiding the present agencies that are striving by sane and common-sense methods to lessen the social evil and white slave traffic. One also wonders how many additional contributions will be withdrawn from charitable, educational and philanthropic organizations by recommendation of the National Woman's Suffrage Association, to supply these large funds.

It is more exciting to attend suffrage meetings, speak to street crowds, walk in parades, and easier to believe in the fallacy that the vote will change all the evils in the world, than it is to give hours, days, thought and energy to quiet, persistent, unheralded work toward the amelioration of the condition of women, children and the unfortunate. The vote never has accomplished, and never will accomplish, all this—only the formation of public opinion, combined with tireless effort, will do it. Why cannot the women of this country, whether suffragists or not, realize and grasp their great and increasing opportunities for influence, which would be hampered by their entrance into political life and strife?

WOMEN VOTE UNWILLINGLY.

ARCHBISHOP RIORDAN, of San Francisco, who was not in favor of woman suffrage for the women of California, has issued an open letter to the Catholic women of that State, advising them to register and vote, saying that the Church approved of women accepting civic duty when it is thrust upon them. It is said that similar letters will be sent to Catholic women in the other five States where suffrage has been granted to them. This is in accord with the opinion which we have already expressed, that suffrage is a duty, not a privilege, and that, as such, women should register and vote in States where they have the franchise.

There is great difficulty in getting them to do so, however. It has been acknowledged that usually women vote at the first election, and that the numbers fall off as the suffrage ceases to be a novelty. In San Francisco, however, in spite of every effort made by suffragists to get women to register—committees having been formed who have used every possible means of persuasion to induce registration—the number falls far short of what was expected. There are 100,000 men votes in San Francisco, 66,000 registered. Of the 75,000 women only 35,000 registered. In some of the smaller cities the percentage was much smaller, as low as 10% in some towns.

We have contended that the majority of women in California did not want suffrage. The results seem to prove that not only were they opposed but are indifferent to the performance of a civic duty which they did not wish. Ignorance cannot be claimed as an explanation, for the suffragist committees seem to have covered the entire city of San Francisco, going into the by-ways and hedges and leaving no method of persuasion untried.

SUFFRAGE AND LIQUOR INTERESTS.

MRS. IDA HUSTED HARPER, in a lecture given at Chautauqua in July, said that opposition to woman suffrage is principally from the liquor interests, corrupt politicians, predatory trusts, selfish men and indifferent women.

In proof of one of these statements she says: "In 1906, in Oregon, all the best interests of the State seemed in line and victory seemed certain; but just before the election the interests sent out a secret circular saying that it was necessary to defeat the amendment and outlining a systematic plan of work. The attorney for the anti-suffragists openly boasted that the liquor dealers put up $250,000 to defeat the cause, over $5 a vote."

Many of Mrs. Harper's statements in print are misleading, whether intentional or not. We have written to Mr. Wallace McCammant, of Portland, Ore., who is probably the attorney referred to, and he writes the following: "You may state posi-

tively and with every assurance that neither I nor any responsible person in Oregon has ever made a statement, publicly or in print, to the effect that $250,000 was expended in the 1906 fight to defeat woman suffrage. The only thing I have ever seen as indicating any admission of the liquor dealers that they had taken a hand in the fight at all was a reported interview in the Oregonian with a man said to be in the liquor business, but who withheld his name. The entire fund spent by the Oregon Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage in 1906 did not exceed $3,000, the chief item of expense being the circularizing of parts of the State with literature."

There was a story circulated in California last year about another $250,000 fund given by the liquor interests. The president of the Liquor Dealers' Association made a printed statement from Los Angeles that not only was that sum not given, but no fund whatever had been contributed, that liquor men, as others, were divided on the subject of suffrage, and why should they be afraid of woman suffrage, any way? The suffrage States were all "wet," and the seventeen Prohibition States were none of them suffrage. His confidence seemed to have been well founded, for at the first election in Los Angeles where women voted the city went "wet" two to one.

SUFFRAGIST'S BAIL.

HELEN CRAGGS, who was found under suspicious circumstances in the garden of Mr. Lewis Harcourt's house at Nuneham, was again remanded at Bullingdon Sessions on Saturday.

Mr. Andrew Walsh asked for bail, and said the prisoner desired him to impress upon the Bench that what she had done had been done from political motives, and not from any malice against Mr. Harcourt personally, or with a view to the destruction of property, or of the endangering of any life.

The chairman said, if the prisoner's theory was admitted politics would be much simplified. She evidently attempted to burn down the house of a political opponent. He did not know of any similar case where bail was granted.—London Daily Mail, July 22.

The foregoing recalls a colored preacher who committed some depredations in the hen-coop of one of his white neighbors. When arrested, he explained with a lucidity worthy of a suffragette that he "couldn't understand" why Mr. Nelson had him arrested. He "hadn't nothin' ag'in Mr. Nelson." He "stole Mr. Nelson's chickens just like he stole any gentleman's chickens." If the impersonal view of crime raises it to the dignity of a political offense our colored brother may also be a patriot in the eyes of the Woman's Social and Political Union. Miss Helen Craggs, whom they fully justify, had "no malice against Mr. Harcourt personally." She apparently destroyed his property just as she would destroy "any gentlemen's" property. This, of course, makes a difference, though whether it is a mitigating circumstance or not depends on the point of view.

IS WOMAN SUFFRAGE SURE TO COME?

WOMAN suffrage is an extreme measure which threatens harm as well as promises good, and extreme measures, if they can be held at bay for a while, subside to that more temperate course which threatens less while it fulfils the better part of the promises.

Women are so necessary for the work of the world that they are bound to be more and more used in its service, not philanthropic alone, but civic as well. As the men already on Boards, Commissions and Committees find the value of the women who work with them, women will be more and more used in appointive positions, and these will be the women selected for their capacity, training and freedom from other obligations. In this way the State will have the benefit of her valuable women citizens, and social conditions will not be disturbed or harmed by the politically valueless. The right of women property-owners to vote on property questions; for mothers to vote on school questions; these and other things will settle themselves in the general readjustment of progress as similar things have done in the past, and are doing all the time. All women interested in the betterment of public affairs can then form a sort of Moral Union which will have an immense influence on public opinion, and through that upon the legislation and the enforcement of the law.

IS WOMAN SUFFRAGE SURE TO COME SOMETIME?

No, not inevitable, not even probable, but of course possible. The longer we succeed in holding off universal suffrage the less apt it is to come. L. P. S.

The Enemy At The Gate.

[*Extracts from an article by Max G. Schlapp, in the "Outlook," April 6, 1912.*]

When it wasn't war it was famine, and when it was neither it was pestilence. Something always seemed to be at work to undermine the human race. Malthus saw it, and concluded that it must always be so, as he believed it was the Divine order. But we have come to see that war and famine and pestilence are all man-made. Through better international relations we are diminishing the destructiveness of war. Through the improvement of transportation and communication we are abolishing famine. And through the achievements of science we are preventing the spread of pestilence.

There is, however, a new evil that has arisen; an enemy that is more insidious as a means of human destruction than either war or famine or pestilence, and more certain of its toll. It is an evil that cannot be eliminated by signing a protocol or cleaning the Augean stables. Neither the sanitary engineers nor laboratory geniuses who have protected the cities against contagion can stay the march of this new enemy.

Briefly, this new enemy is the tension of modern life. It is that commercial ogre, our industrial system, which is sapping the strength of the race. The results of it are newly born criminals or newly born imbeciles in every grade of life, high and low, irrespective of environment. Explicitly, the human family is breaking itself down.

Never before has the world done its work under such high tension as to-day. Living conditions have actually become a contest comparable only to a foot race; but present living conditions compel us to use from the start the strength reserved for the final effort, the last burst of speed, if we are to gain the honors. . . .

Industrialism that is absorbing the vitalities of men is doing still greater damage to women. It used to be somewhat unusual for women to go out into the world of work. Only the daughters of the very poorest families gave their lives to industrialism. Now women have almost displaced men in many kinds of employment. Office work is done almost exclusively by women. The great office buildings of the city are filled with women employees. Factory upon factory employs women and girls exclusively. . . .

All of us are unconscious imitators. We follow the customs. Ambitious ones take men of the greatest physical or mental energy for their patterns in planning success or recognition. Their own limitations are not in account. The public men who attend several receptions, several dinners and make ten or twelve speeches in an afternoon and evening, besides traveling as many miles as make a day of work for a trainman, are not a phenomenon, but only a reflex of crass industry that demands all there is in a man from day to day. The woman who belongs to clubs and societies, acting on scores of committees, taking part in meetings, negotiating business deals for the cause, until she trembles from the excitement of it all, is following the example, spurred

on by a restless energy that is due to disregard of mental and physical hygiene. . . .

We have here the first explanation of the abnormally active woman. The nervous organization works peculiar changes in body and mind. One moved by the excitation of the involuntary nervous system may be possessed of an outward calm and remain unconscious that his physical forces are in a state of alarm. At that point there is no rest until the whole world sleeps, and sometimes not then. The mind, perfectly sane, but balanced like a hair-trigger, becomes supersensitive to external impressions. Calm judgment leaves it. It becomes enthusiastic over a propaganda at which before it would be aghast.

Pleasures cease to give the stimulation desired, and new ideas come that seem, and perhaps are, bigger and worthier. Then women advance, as they have now, to dispute the philosophy of the ages, to contest with men in all pursuits and set up their own plans of life.

Gentle women, naturally retiring and unassertive, become suffragists and suffragettes, and they stand boldly on a soap-box in a public square, before a motley throng, to proclaim their demands.

These same women, driven by the exigencies of the hour, approve such conduct on the part of their sisters as that of breaking up meetings, storming and insulting public men in the streets, throwing stones and smashing windows. These conditions are only an evidence of a nervous distress that has become universal. . . .

Machinery wears out. The human body, unlike machinery, rebuilds itself, but its constructive power is not proportioned to opportunities for self-destruction. The modern Moloch that we all obey is making us wear ourselves out. Our energies are overdrawn. We are developing a womanhood that is becoming free of the instinctive desire for motherhood, and frequently without the capacity for it. The racial strength of reproduction is declining. The birth rate drops, and of the children born the proportion of those infirm increases, so at last we are confronted with the proof that the high-speed effort of our daily lives has brought suffering not only upon ourselves, but also upon our children. It is shocking to contemplate how far the visitation has extended.

The rate is told in figures. There are more criminals and imbeciles to each 1,000 of population than ever before. There are fewer births to each 1,000 population. . . .

The time must come when the results of close supervision of disease and suppression of disease-breeding conditions will reach its maxim, and the inevitable death rate become irreducible. With the birth rate then falling in the most advanced countries of the world, the end of either of the present-day civilization or the end of all becomes apparent. It is not alone because fewer children are being brought into the world that we have cause for grave concern for the perpetuity of the races. It is not alone because children are not coming in sufficient numbers, *but because the number of defectives born has grown alarmingly, and is constantly increasing in proportion to each 1,000 of population. This is the awful menace.* The power of human thought and action is shackled before it. We may modify it, check it in places, but we cannot exterminate it by any process known to us now, or that seems at this time likely to come to us, unless we can change the temper and reduce the intensity of our modern industrial and social life. . . .

When overwrought women have disturbed within themselves the process of nature, they impart a disturbance to their offspring, and, instead of the development of a normal human being, there is one distorted in body or mind, or in both. It is fundamental that the female must be quiescent. It is fundamental because of the basic difference between the male and the female cell. The female cell is quiescent. Its normal development depends upon this state.

Latter-day women, driven by the strife of the elements within them to enormous exertions, are asking in what way women are inferior to men and are attempting to demonstrate their equal physical endurance. It is not a question of equality at all. It is one of physical difference in the sexes which forbids women from performing either factory labor or disquieting tasks. . . .

Nature has ordained that woman keep in store potential energy for the hour that she may be called upon to impart it to her offspring, and nature has provided her own way for using up monthly the surplus energy that woman accumulates and does not need. The moment she needs it, being with child, nature stops the monthly waste, and while that child needs nourishment and stimulation from her, before and after birth, the woman's function that wastes energy ceases. It is the law—a law that no amount of modern woman argument can set aside—that this monthly waste of energy shall take place in the female if she does not need it for her young, and that it shall not be wasted in any other form than that provided. Nature provides the store and provides for depleting it, that its process may go on unbroken. When a woman persists in being manlike in her physical and mental activities, exerting her strength to the limit of her endurance, she will use up energy faster than the cells can store it, and in extreme cases the natural function will cease. There will be no surplus energy to carry off, and no necessity for nature to establish her customary facilities for caring for it. Women so afflicted lose the habits, the inclinations and the powers of their sex.

A woman, with capacity still remaining, but physically unbalanced by constant over-exertion, or through alcohol or drugs have the same unbalancing effect, cannot be expected to impart to her child the normal stimulant or normal amount of hormon that the child must have for its normal development. Why it is that the brain cells of the child are likely to be most affected we do not know, but presumably the brain cells are the most delicate, the most vulnerable, of any of the groups, and their process the most refined. . . .

Statistics show us only the feeble-minded persons in institutions. We have no way of recognizing or estimating the number of those outside, but if we could get the figures they would be astounding. A law should be enacted requiring that all feeble-minded persons, whether in institutions or at liberty, be registered by the State. . . .

Leaving the facts as they are, let us, entering the field of conjecture, inquire what is to become of us? It might be satisfying to know, and, again, it might be disquieting. I am inclined to believe that only experience—the experience not only of the individual, but also of the race—changes the course of human affairs; that therefore industrialism and its allies will continue to weaken the people of the modern world until they will no longer be able to respond to the call of extreme effort. By that time, unless other peoples, not weakened by this fever, take the place of supremacy away from us, men will find it possible to spend strength that is only sufficient for their daily needs, and the rebuilding of our race should begin. It is possible, however, that long before that time sincere and wise men and women, possibly the churches, will undertake, before it is too late, to teach mankind that it has been misguided, and that it is not God's will that men should be put upon the rack in order that there may be created new and useless wealth. Possibly the multitudes of men will be taught to smite the industrial monster that is warping the generations to come, and, scorning the menace of it, will take time for peaceful pleasures and recuperative repose; and women relieved of those burdens and turning from those ambitions that weakened their distinctive powers, will be restored to that manner of life which will enable them to rejuvenate the race.

There are two ways, then, in which we ought to deal with the facts that we have here faced. First, we ought to alleviate the wrong conditions that now exist—be intelligent in our study and treatment of crime, in our dealings with delinquents and with those who are mentally unbalanced, and especially in the care of defective children. And, second, we ought to resist excessive demands upon our energies and promote whatever will bring back men and women, especially women, to that which is normal.

Woman Suffrage a Mistaken Theory of Progress.

Address Delivered by Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, at Chautauqua, N. Y., July 20, 1912.

The historian of this period will have rather a curious phenomenon to record, that while there have been instances where people have banded together and demanded suffrage to right their wrongs, it has remained for the enlightened twentieth century to witness the birth and development, not only in this country but also in England, of a well-organized movement among the unenfranchised class against having suffrage forced upon them. This fact is significant, and everywhere men and women all over the country to-day are awakening to the realization that the opposition to woman suffrage must be based upon some fundamental principles and not upon the mere whim, as is sometimes said of women who do not want to vote.

"Votes for Women" has an alluring sound, but there are hundreds rallying around the banner with this device who have no idea what they would do with the ballot if they had it; who do not understand the relation between suffrage and government; who are utterly ignorant of woman's legal status in the community, and who have been carried away by mere catch words and phrases which they have never stopped to reason out to a conclusion.

Those of us who are opposing the extension of suffrage to our sex have entirely eliminated all personal feeling in the consideration of the subject. It is not a question with us as to whether we want to vote or do not want to vote; it is the welfare of the State and race we have at heart, and the careful study of this question not merely from its biological or scientific side, but also from the point of view of governmental expediency has convinced us that suffrage would but add another responsibility to those woman already carries, without giving her any compensating advantage; that the social structure of the State would be weakened by attempting to equalize and identify government shattered by making possible a majority which could not enforce its own rule, and that therefore woman suffrage would be a step backward, and not one in advance.

This question of investing women with political responsibility is erroneously associated in the minds of many with all the marked changes which have taken place in woman's position during the past half century, but there is, as a matter of fact, a wide difference between civil rights, which constitutes individual freedom, and which women have attained during this period, and political power and responsibility which in reality is the imposition of public duties which must be performed for the best interests of the State. No one will deny that under the old Common Law which we inherited from England, woman suffered from many legal disabilities, but man has not only removed these, but has granted her rights and privileges which, in most States, far exceed his own. Then there are all the other changes which have taken place in woman's position during the past half century. Colleges and universities have opened their doors to her, and to-day there is practically no profession or industry which she may not enter. But these changes have all been brought about with but slight opposition because they have been in the natural line of development, since all have been an extension of woman's civil or private rights, and the course of progress always lies in this direction. But personal freedom has little or nothing to do with sovereign authority. Individual woman entered the college and university. Because one woman elected to study medicine all women were not obliged to, but "Votes for Women" means votes for all women. This, therefore, is the line of cleavage which the anti-suffragists recognize between this question of investing woman with political responsibility and all the other changes in woman's position during the past sixty years. The extension of suffrage to woman does not mean the extension of another right to the individual woman, but rather the imposition of another duty upon all women in addition to those they already carry. Therefore, woman's rights and woman suffrage are not one and the same thing, but are in reality far apart. Woman has attained her civil rights and individual freedom without the ballot. If it were known to-morrow that the women in this State would never vote, not a single activity in which they are now engaged would be curtailed; their philanthropy would not be lessened, nor their civic work weakened. No college or university would close their doors to them, and they would not be excluded from any professions or industries.

* * * *

The suffragists tell us that influence such as women now possess without responsibility is dangerous. If influence without responsibility is dangerous, political authority without political responsibility would be a thousand times more dangerous. It would be a farce, for all the talk in the world cannot alter the fact that the State has been built up by man. Its institutions, its commerce and industries—everything that secures its stability—depend in the last resort upon masculine strength and courage, and therefore the real responsibility of maintaining the State rests with men.

* * * *

The word progress is one of magic, potent, force at the present day. Many men and women are so eager to be considered progressive they jump to the conclusion that every half-baked theory of reform or quack political nostrum must be progressive. This is a very crude way of looking at things and does not denote much thought. But progress to be genuine must conform with natural laws, and the increasing tendency on the part of woman to assume the functions of man is at distinct variance with two natural laws. First, the essential and intended difference in sex activity, and second, the great law of evolution which teaches that the development of the race has been a continuous growth in specialization. The history of civilization shows that, as civilization advances, the respective functions of men and women are more definitely developed, and subtle differences of temperament or nature more pronounced. A recognition of this difference does not imply superiority of one sex or inferiority of the other. In this dualism of human life one supplies what the other lacks.

Frederic Harrison tells us "that the true function of man and woman is to be the complement each of the other and the effort to assimilate is a step toward barbarism."

Advocates of woman suffrage dislike to have the question of sex brought into a discussion of the subject. They boastfully assert there is no "sex in politics," and seek to put this argument in the background, knowing full well that it is the crucial point of the whole discussion.

No sane person believes sex was an accident in the creative scheme. Men and women were created with their special functions which at the outset preclude them from doing the same work in the world. This differentiation of function has developed in all these ages a differentiation of nature and temperament which is reflected in the manner in which they work. A woman does her work through sympathy, a man through action; a woman through her instincts, a man through reason. Man tends to compel woman to influence.

One scientist tells us that "man has a greater capacity for rational processes—a capacity for endurance of the rational faculty, while in woman the deficiency of endurance of the rational capacity is associated with general incapacity for mental strain, and therefore as her emotional nature is stronger there is an easy break-down under stress and excitement."

Nothing can illustrate this point more clearly than the actions of the militant suffragettes in England. Their nervous systems have been so over-stimulated that they have reached a neuras-

thenic condition which has weakened their mental balance, and they have been swept along by a current of influences which they have entirely lost their power to resist. Would such an overstrained, hysterical force in the electorate benefit the State in a time of grave political crisis? Biologically nature intended woman to be a conserver of energy, or anabolic, to use the scientific term. She is going contrary to nature and therefore is taking a backward step in this attempt to follow in the footsteps of man and become a dispenser of energy, or katabolic.

There are those who will say that it is useless to talk about the conservatism of woman's energy, since so many women have been forced through economic conditions to enter into industrial life.

I am not here this morning to talk about the woman in industry, although it is a subject in which I am very deeply interested. I believe she presents, perhaps, the greatest problem in our life to-day, but time forbids us now from inquiring into the forces which have placed her there, or the forces which keep her there, or the forces which might be set in motion to get her out of this life. But I must touch upon the question of suffrage in this connection with the wage-earning woman, because it is said that since she is out in the world working by the side of man, or as his competitor, she must have the ballot as a matter of justice, not only to assure the increase in her wages, but also to improve the conditions under which she works. This assertion is based upon fallacious reasoning. The claim that woman's wages would be raised if she is given the ballot cannot be substantiated in any way; the working man has not been able to get even a living wage by voting on election day, neither has he been able to shorten his working day through the ballot. That is the reason he has organized trades unions and participated in strikes. It is the unions, and not suffrage, which have raised men's wages. Woman's wages are lower than man's for two reasons: one because of the overcrowding of occupations, and the other because of the temporary nature of her work. Two-thirds of the wage-earning women in this country cease to be wage earners when they are thirty-five years old, and forty-five per cent. cease to be wage earners when they are twenty-five years old.

Three years ago the Supreme Court at Washington rendered the famous decision that a law limiting the hours of woman's work was constitutional on the ground that as the mother of the race she had a right to such protection which a man working by her side did not possess. Since this decision several States have passed laws definitely shortening the hours of woman's labor, and in every instance these laws have been upheld as constitutional. These changes have not been brought about through any act of suffrage, but because public opinion is aroused to the necessity of tempering the condition under which women work if we are to have a strong and vigorous race. Unless the ballot is given to woman in the near future all these reforms, which are in the line of evolutionary development, will have been placed on the statute books by man.

* * * *

The anti-suffragist is accused of being an "obstructionist." We claim, on the contrary, we are the "constructive" element in the State to-day. It is "a wise woman who buildeth her house. The foolish plucketh it down with her hands."

We do not believe our social order can be cured by pulling down the foundations upon which it stands. With all lines of constructive social reform we are in hearty sympathy, and we are confident we can do our work better along these lines because we are outside of politics. Untrammeled by any party affiliation or obligation we can go before any legislative committee or organization and ask for the passage of any measure, and what we have to say will be listened to on the merits of the case, and not because we voted with this or that party on the last election day. We feel we would lose immeasurably if this power were taken from us, for we should then become another spoke in the wheel of political machinery.

Some Reasons for Opposition to Woman Suffrage.

Fred A. Ewald Discusses the Question of Why Women Should Not Be Granted the Ballot.

One of the great questions of the day is whether or not the women of our commonwealths should vote. It is a subject that may assert a growing importance in the land of the "setting sun," within the boundaries of which lies the great Treasure State, Montana. Geographically we seem to be in the suffrage zone. so to speak. While the West may not be the "cradle" of the equal-suffrage movement, it surely is its "nursery," and neighbor States, after very brief courtships, have adopted unto themselves this new political arrangement, for "better or for worse." In most of these States there has been but little organized opposition to the movement, and men, influenced by the argument advanced by suffragist agitators that women are entitled to vote as a "matter of right," have cast their ballots in favor of constitutional amendments of enfranchisement without having given the matter a more careful consideration.

The writer is of the opinion that women are not entitled to vote, as a "matter of right," and that to give them the unqualified privilege of franchise would only tend to increase the disharmonies existing in our social and political life, without entailing any important beneficial results. In reaching this conclusion, the social, intellectual, political and biblical phases of the question are waived, and the reason for her disqualification is based chiefly upon the physical incapacity of woman to share with man the great fundamental burdens of government. This view of the question evolves nothing new or startling. The reason has been advanced on occasion, or at least suggested, but suffragists, rather by ridicule than by logic, have succeeded in cowing it into the background. They appreciate the merit of the argument and, when they attempt to meet it at all, recite some such examples of feminine valor as the Amazons, Semiramis, Aspasia, etc., all for the most part of legendary origin, or attempt to divert the attention by saying that we are now governed by intellectual precepts, and that physical force is no longer a factor.

Some day, in the dim future, this latter argument may have more weight, but its proponents are advancing it all too soon. We haven't reached the age when State laws enforce themselves, and the lion and the lamb are not yet reposing peacefully together on our national border.

In the olden days, when men wielded war clubs and battle-axes, history does not record that there were suffragettes clamoring for a share in the business of government. It required no argument in those strenuous times to convince the women that the protection of life and property is a pastime that men alone are peculiarly fitted to engage in. In our age only the manner of protection has changed. Physical strength is no less necessary, but, because of our complex civilization, it has become less conspicuous. The State has come to exercise many functions for the welfare of its people, and the women are impressed only with the "fancy work" and the "pink teas" of government, as it were, in all of which they feel fully qualified to act a part.

It is part of the Divine plan that the animal kingdom shall continue to exist. To this end is the natural instinct, the "love of life," implanted in all its members. This instinct prompts the exercising of the powers of defense and protection, which results in the law of the "survival of the fittest." This law demands that the principal burden of defense and protection shall fall to those members of the species who are best able to defend and protect. The males of all the species are created physically the stronger of the sexes, and in the human family, the burden descends naturally to man because of his superior physical strength. He has performed this duty throughout all the ages.

As men become more civilized they associate themselves into governments. The members of a constitutional government express their preferences by ballot. A ballot, or vote, is something more than the mere registering of a wish or a desire. It is rather in the nature of a demand. This is evidenced by the fact that the majority can compel the placing in effect of the issues carried at an election, by bringing to bear the entire civil and military machinery of the land. Then how absurd for women to claim a right to demand, through a ballot, when she must inevitably turn to man to enforce her demand, should it be refused! For it must always be the men who shall stand ready, with their lives if need be, to enforce the ballot, should a crisis arise following an election.

But, say the suffragists, the war period is over, and national controversies will, henceforth, be settled by arbitration. The fallacy of this argument lies in the fact that there is nothing upon which to base it. World-wide arbitration is an experiment at best. Since the dawn of history we have had wars upon wars. The past century has been no exception. It is hardly probable that peace advocates can change the natures of men and nations, and, by contract, eliminate warfare in a day. If nations did not become angry they wouldn't fight. Almost as well might two individuals, while sober, contract not to pummel each other when intoxicated. Treaties, under high tension, snap like pipe-stems, and the alternative will ever be war with all its horrors. The peace movement is a praiseworthy one and should beget much good, but with the smoke of battle lowering over its horizon, the peace dove at The Hague is, at present, a most crestfallen bird.

It is said, as civilization advances, the danger of war decreases. This is probably true. Yet we, with our ranking culture and refinement, have been known, in the past, "to pick a fight." The truth is, we are still a fighting nation. Few of us would much enjoy seeing the second largest navy in the world sailing about bedecked in olive branches, its flag drooping in the breeze.

We delight in the boom of our heavy guns. The fife and drum make music for our ears. We plant rusty cannon on our public squares. With the sword and the bayonet and with battle pictures we decorate our homes. Our heroes we love to praise in song and story, and we have even been known to buy one of them a home in Washington. We love brass buttons and the uniform, and a military quickstep causes the blood to tingle. We do not want to fight but, as a nation, we are not yet ready to beg for quarter.

Again, say the women, "Give us the ballot and there will be no war; we will vote against it." This were well, had their votes sufficient charm to prevent wars against us. When the Theban army appeared upon the plains of Laconia, it is said, the Spartan women were "excited to frantic demonstrations of distress." Should a hostile army appear among us, our American ladies would, of course, behave more sensibly. Their best judgment, as voters, would prompt them at once to call an election, levy a war tax upon man's property and send him forth to fight back the enemy, while they remained at home, to vote more taxes, and to send more men to be killed if necessary. This is not idle supposition. All about us are wars and rumors of wars. Veterans of three wars are to-day drawing pensions from our public treasury. The Japanese war scare is hardly over. Only a few months past our national army, ready for war, was facing a belligerent nation. And O woman, may a supreme wisdom ever guide thy voting aright, that it may not later stand forth to accuse thee of the spilling of innocent blood! Of the consequences of this, the consciences of our confederate women are free, as their votes were not instrumental in bringing on the four long years of useless carnage, from the effects of which we have not yet fully recovered.

Political scientists teach that the first object of government is the protection of life, liberty and property. The force of destruction is great. By natural law, the force of protection must be equally strong and, as stated, its burden must be borne by the men. The duty is a dangerous one, and nearly every precinct in the land mourns the loss of firemen, or police, or other protection officers, fallen in the course of duty. In all this woman cannot share a part. She must be consistent and not demand most wise short-day laws for women, because of the physical weakness of the sex, and at the same time maintain that she has the physical strength to work with the policeman, and beside the soldier in the field.

We hear much of the "ignorant voter," and the suffragist picture of the colored porter and the well-dressed woman is familiar. But the "ignorant voter" and the colored man were at Bunker Hill, and Monterey, and Gettysburg and San Juan; and both continue ready, with their lives if necessary, to protect life and property, and to save the State. Both fought and suffered to establish and to maintain a voting system of government. The men of China have been fighting for the same thing. In this movement he Chinese women were conspicuous only by being in the way; yet, in a short time, ambitious suffragettes will be stumping that country to convince the Celestial women that they are entitled to vote, as a "matter of right." However, this is not a plea for a physical suffrage test. But it is a plea for the principle, that to the sex alone responsible for the protection and preservation of life, property and State should be given the exclusive right to determine among themselves when, where and why their lives shall be placed in jeopardy.

Women seemingly associate the right to vote with the natural rights of life, liberty and property. Voting is not a right at all; it is a privilege. Many voters are deprived of their votes, yet it hardly attracts passing notice. The ballot, like office, is wholly subject to the interests of all, and should be conferred or withheld accordingly. We say that the people are "sovereign," which means, in theory at least, that each vote is cast solely for the benefit of the whole, and not alone for the individual welfare of the voter. The natural rights do not include the right to govern others, and all democracies have had their suffrage qualifications. In the end the important thing for all is that we be governed well, and the women subject to our government have had no cause to complain.

Women have voted in Colorado since 1893. Unbiased residents of that State tell us that the promised reforms are not forthcoming, and that the only difference seems to be that they now have with them the professional woman "wire-puller" and politician, who, it is said, is no less corrupt than her male contemporary. Practically similar laws have been passed by male legislatures in neighboring States, that the women claim credit for having passed in Colorado. Enough women voted in Los Angeles to control the issues of the last election, yet prohibition was voted down by a tremendous majority. Idaho succumbed to "votes for women" in 1896. Last Fall prohibition was an issue in Kotenai County and in Cœur d'Alene, its county seat. A large number of women both voted and worked against the measure, and county and city are again "wet." The women of Wallace, Idaho, pass the front door of their "restricted" district whenever they walk down their main business street.

To many it appears that women have enough influence in human affairs without seeking to be voters and politicians. In the home, church and school their influence exceeds that of the men. Our boys and girls recite exclusively to women throughout the grades. There are hardly more than two or three men teachers in each of our high schools, and, in the West, at least, a man county superintendent of schools, or commissioner, is coming to be rather a curiosity.

Ours is an era of great national unrest. At such times people are known to depart from the beaten way, and travel bypaths, unknown and dangerous. The boundaries of our political parties are at present dimly defined. There are no great national issues to divide the people, and ambitious politicians are unearthing all the "isms" of government, in order to find hobbies on which to ride into office. May the good ship Montana ride well the storm, and not, at last, come limping into port, in tow of that adventurous bark, woman's suffrage, which hails from the rocky and wreck-strewn coast of that dangerous land, Experiment.

Great Falls, March 8, 1912. Fred A. Ewald.

Woman Suffrage and Social Welfare.

By O. J. Campbell, Assistant Professor of English, University of Wisconsin.

Those women who maintain that by means of the ballot they will be able to accomplish definite needed reforms, make, I think, the most persuasive plea for what they call "equal suffrage." They base their case not on Rousseau's high-sounding political maxims, but on a noble desire to help in solving the engrossing social and political problems of to-day. However, many women actively engaged in social service of various sorts are opposed to woman suffrage. They say, and wisely, I think, that through the extension of the ballot to all women, their present unique influence in obtaining the remedial legislation that they desire will be submerged in an ignorant and indifferent majority. This assertion always provokes the instant and withering scorn of your professional suffragist. "If women accomplish much by 'indirect' methods of persuasion," she says, "they will naturally accomplish much more by the 'direct' method of the ballot." But the problem is not so simple as this dangerously facile logic assumes. Indeed, this use of the words "direct" and "indirect" betrays a superstitious belief in what Matthew Arnold calls "machinery."

Far more important than the privilege of voting is the power of creating effective public opinion. Legislative enactment unless expressive of public opinion is worse than useless. The ballot which stands for nothing more than the existence of Smith or Brown on election day is a worse than futile ballot. Now the influence which interested, educated women have in making public opinion on certain subjects alert and well-nigh expert, is everywhere regarded as enormous.

The organization which the federation of women's clubs has perfected for this very purpose is a model of efficiency. Legislatures have been unusually responsive to organized women's requests for legislation. They assume that such women speak disinterestedly and authoritatively, particularly about the needs of women and children. Instances of this essentially direct influence of women upon legislation are extremely numerous. Perhaps the two most important laws passed by a recent irresponsive Illinois Legislature were the Women's Ten-Hour Law and the Mothers' Pension Law, both laws systematically advocated by women. One of the most striking results of this influence was the passage of the suffrage bill itself through the Wisconsin Legislature—a bill for which even the most ardent suffragists now admit there was precious little public demand when it was passed.

"But it is so hard to get a law through by these indirect methods!" exclaim the suffragists. Of course it is hard. The final crystallization of public sentiment into law ought to be a deliberate and slow process. It is better for reformers to chafe under the inertia of public interest than for the public to chafe under a law which is the expression of no general desire. The suffragist would find her "direct" method no easier. As for the present method of procedure being "indirect" in any real sense, I deny it completely. A more direct and systematic method of arousing public opinion and of ensuring its speedy expression in law than that habitually adopted by club women could hardly be imagined.

"This influence of women upon legislation is well known," exclaims the suffragist impatiently. "How, pray, will the possession of the ballot interfere with this influence? It will simply give her a reserve instrument of force to use when her present methods of persuasion fail."

Yet the possession of the ballot would at least partially destroy women's present unique political influence for two reasons. First, it would immediately rob their opinions of their present disinterested appearance. Their proposals would at once be regarded as attempted advantages for the party to which they belonged. They could no longer win respectful hearing as persons distinctly above party strife. They would, like men, be compelled to work through party leaders. The singular directness of their present methods would be completely lost. The second and more important reason is that much effort that is now applied to the solution of social problems would be diverted to the mechanics of political organization. Experience in the suffrage States—not those perhaps where the ballot is still a new toy—has shown one thing beyond question: that the great mass of middle-class women of family remain indifferent to the ballot.

To offset the vicious vote on the one hand, and to arouse the indifferent on the other, the women of the sort who are now a power in politics are forced to work vigorously to keep their intelligence from being completely nullified. Time will, I fear, never greatly change this situation. The number of women possessing the time and energy to devote to the intelligent study of politics will inevitably remain limited. Such women are now the only ones who exercise any real influence on politics. The indifferent, the ignorant and the vicious woman is without influence. This situation from the point of view of political efficiency is nearly ideal. Power is vested only in the fit. Universal woman suffrage would immediately destroy this ideal situation. It would distribute power among women qualified for holding it and those not qualified. Because, then, woman suffrage would inevitably nullify and probably submerge the one thoroughly unselfish, enlightened influence brought to the discussion and solution of our social and political problems, it would be for many vitally interested in public welfare a distinct social calamity.

FIVE-YEAR TERM FOR DUBLIN SUFFRAGETTES.

Mrs. Leigh and Miss Evans to Penal Servitude.

Dublin, August 7.—Mrs. Mary Leigh and Miss Gladys Evans, suffragettes, were sentenced to-day to five years penal servitude each.

Miss Mary Baker was sentenced to seven months' imprisonment as an accomplice.

The two women, with others, were charged with attempting to burn the Theatre Royal here on July 18th to prevent Premier Asquith from speaking there the evening afterward.

The alleged arson consisted in hurling a blazing chair from one of the theatre boxes during a performance. Some petroleum was found in the box.

Miss Evans was first convicted yesterday and held for sentence until the trial of Mrs. Leigh concluded to-day.

The sentences pronounced against Mrs. Leigh and Miss Evans to-day were by far the severest imposed for suffragette demonstrations since the "votes for women" campaigners adopted militant tactics several years ago.

Several hundred women have received terms for a few days up to two or three months in jail for window smashing, taking part in riots, assaults on Cabinet members and kindred offenses, but the present occasion is the first on which they have been treated as criminals of the more serious sort.

The authorities incline to congratulate themselves that the example made of Mrs. Leigh and Miss Evans will have an intimidating effect upon the suffragette militants.

Aside from the severity of the sentence, they doubt if it will be possible for the suffragettes to make heroines of the two Dublin prisoners, as they have in the past of those who have served jail sentences.

The reason of the reason need not be a reason. Englishwomen, because they want to vote, want to burn and maim. Imprisoned for wanting to burn and maim, they say they are in prison for wanting to vote.

A LETTER AND AN ANSWER.

SUFFRAGETTE "OUTRAGES."

To the Editor of the New York Times:

The transatlantic cablegrams about suffragette "outrages" should be taken with several grains of salt. During the last eight years almost every sensational dispatch dealing with this movement has turned out to be untrue or distorted.

To name only a few conspicuous cases, there was the story that Augustine Birrell had been kicked and lamed, which was later contradicted on his own authority; there was the report that corrosive acid had been poured into the ballot boxes at Bermondsey, when it was in fact a harmless mixture of ink and photographic chemicals, and there was the widely circulated myth about Lady Constance Lytton and her hatchet.

Lady Constance, who was represented in the American press as a vindictive virago running amuck with a dangerous weapon, never used a hatchet at all. She is a woman so exceptionally sweet and kind that she is called in her own family "Angel Con." Olive Schreiner dedicated her book, "Woman and Labor," to her, as one of the noblest human beings she had ever met. Indignant with the heavy sentences imposed on certain suffragists for slight offenses—sentences that she believed to be excessive and illegal—Lady Constance and her friend, Mrs. Brailsford, the wife of an influential journalist, decided to take part in a demonstration themselves, and see whether women of social position would be treated in the same way. Lady Constance threw a stone at the automobile in which a Cabinet Minister was riding, aiming it carefully so as to hit the car, not its inmates. Mrs. Brailsford would not throw a stone, because she was uncertain of her aim and feared she might hurt somebody. Instead she hid a meat chopper under a bouquet, made her way up to the wooden barrier that had been put up to keep women away from a Cabinet Minister's meeting, and, in full view of several policemen, made one chop at the barrier, and was immediately arrested. Both women were let off easily, though "commoners" were suffering severe punishment for similar acts. The authorities tested Lady Constance's heart, and said it was too weak for her to undergo forcible feeding. Disgusted with this snobbery, Lady Constance cut off her hair, put on poor clothes, and, under an assumed name, took part in a demonstration before the jail in Liverpool where suffragette prisoners were being treated with great brutality. She was committed to prison, and not only fed by force, but slapped in the face by the prison doctor, and so roughly treated that she has never recovered her health since. She proved up to the hilt her contention that in dealing with suffragists there was one law for the rich and another for the poor. And this was the whole foundation for the absurd hatchet story. We have now been treated to another tale of a hatchet. It should be accepted with great reserve till the exact facts are known.

There is no doubt that one section of the suffragists in England are protesting against the bad faith of the Cabinet Ministers by some very extraordinary demonstrations; but the stories that they are bent on homicide and slaughter may safely be set down as malicious canards. During the last eight years the suffragettes have never killed nor seriously hurt any one, while several of them have lost their lives (including Mrs. Pankhurst's sister), and a great number have been injured for life by the violence of the anti-suffragists.

Alice Stone Blackwell.

Chilmark, Mass., July 31, 1912.

HARMLESS SUFFRAGETTES.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

"Out of the cater came forth meat." Another paradox: Out of the serious comes forth mirth—pure fun. See the letter of Alice Stone Blackwell to "The Times" of to-day. That intense lady discusses the British reports of suffragette violence with all her precious faith in the solemnity of things.

She tells of the exaggerations from which "The Cause" suffers, and says, "There was the report that corrosive acid had been poured into the ballot boxes at Bermondsey, when it was in fact a harmless mixture of ink and photographic chemicals." Now, under certain circumstances ink and photographic chemicals are not only harmless, they are even useful. But, then, if harmless in a ballot box, why under heaven did they put them there?

She proceeds to an account of "Angel Con's" and Mrs. Brailsford's gentle use of stones and meat choppers, from which we learn that only expert stone throwing, insured not to hurt any one, comes up to the suffrage standards. So "Angel Con" carefully deposited a stone (probably swaddled in cotton) in the automobile of the Cabinet Minister, a gentle token of respect to the representative of authority. But her companion, not being an expert stone hurler (still under the handicap of sex in the matter of hurling), and fearing she might hurt some one, did not participate in that function. With milder thoughts of violence, "she hid a meat chopper under a bouquet [meat choppers being less dangerous than stones]" and courageously, "in full view of several policemen," made one gentle dab at the barrier. Why? Why because "the barrier was put up to protect Cabinet Ministers from women," Miss Blackwell says. A kind of symbolical blow, you see—a protest, an intimation that the women wanted to get at the Ministers. But, query: Did she remove the bouquet before the meat chopper's gentle flight?

In spite of stones and hatchets, however, it appears by Miss Blackwell's tearful report (I think I hear tears) that "during the last eight years the suffragettes have never killed or seriously hurt any one!" Truly these suffragettes are worthy of the mantle of Joan of Arc, which they claim. They are children of light, working miracles. People who can hurl stones, shatter great quantities of glass, burn theatres and assault the heads (literally) of Government, and yet never do any harm, must be earning their halos. Canonization awaits them.

But the meat of the matter lies in this explanation of the stones and hatchets: "Lady Constance ['Angel Con'] being indignant with the heavy sentences imposed on certain suffragettes for slight offenses [such as personal assaults on public officials, destroying property and the like]—sentences that she believed to be excessive and illegal"—Gentlemen of the jury, what do you think of that? Which she believed to be "excessive and illegal!"—goes on the war path, to submit to trial by stones and meat choppers a difference of opinion between a private individual and the Government under whose protection she lives.

Oh, women! in our hours of ease uncertain and mighty hard to please.

Mrs. William Forse Scott.

Yonkers, N. Y., August 2, 1912.

JANE ADDAMS REPLIES

To Mrs. Harper's Assertion That Mr. Roosevelt Tricked Suffragists.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

May I reply to the letter of Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, appearing in The Times of Aug. 22, that Col. Roosevelt's address, published by order of the United States Senate, was written before he came to Chicago, and that, after consultation with Judge Lindsey and other suffragists, he omitted the statement to which Mrs. Harper so naturally objects, and gave instructions to the press agents and newspapers that the sentence should be eliminated.

His spoken address was most unequivocally in favor of woman suffrage. The Senate document, therefore, was not printed from a "revised and certified edition," but from a first draft. The platform to which Col. Roosevelt and the new party were pledged, and upon which the campaign must be made, Mrs. Harper admits was most satisfactory in its advocacy of equal suffrage.

The women who attended the convention have no doubt of the sincerity of the Progressive party or of Col. Roosevelt in this matter, and they cannot but regret that Mrs. Harper has departed from the non-partisan attitude which she so ably advocated in your columns.

Jane Addams.

Hull's Cove, Me., Aug. 23, 1912.

The Senate reproduction of Mr. Roosevelt's speech was presented by Mr. Poindexter and ordered to be printed on Aug. 9, three days after it was read before the Progressive Convention at Chicago. It contains under the headline, "Would Leave Vote to the Women," this sentence, which Miss Addams says Judge Lindsey and other suffragists persuaded him to omit from the press copy of his speech:

"In those conservative States where there is genuine doubt how the women stand on this matter [equal suffrage] I suggest that it be referred to a vote of the women, so that they may themselves make the decision."

Mrs. Harper accused Mr. Roosevelt of inserting the sentence in the revised document as representing his true belief, in defiance of the hostility of the suffragists to State referendums on this question.—Editor N. Y. Times.

CHIVALRY FALSE AND TRUE.

There is no more foolish and false conception of chivalry to-day in its relation to woman than the one which would condone in her on the part of man any grave transgression of virtue or womanliness simple because she is a woman. This is truly the malady to-day in the so-called chivalry of America. No; we will make an exception to this in the case of the Southern people, whose idea of true chivalry, as regards the attitude and bearing of man toward woman, is, to our mind, not only a correct one, but the splendid fruitage of years of chivalrous life and living.

Scarcely a single day blossoms in its canopy o'er our head that we do not witness around us the vagaries of women that clearly establish the fact that the real duties of womanhood are being entirely lost sight of, and that the desire for the limelight in some shape or another has entered the very soul of the woman of to-day—that to be at peace with God and peace with herself and peace with her neighbor is now well-nigh impossible.

Criminologists and psychologists are endeavoring to divine the reason for this. One attributes it to nervousness, another to the vanishing of the moral factor in our life, and still another to the feminizing of man and masculinizing of woman.

Just look to-day at our courts and see the array of murderesses that stand at its bar. Some of them women born into luxury and nurtured in what is termed refinement. It is no answer to this to say: Look, too, at the army of men charged with felony. Granted. It all registers a weakening of moral life and an utter defiance of authority.

But is it not true that thirty or forty years ago a woman at the bar as a criminal was rare indeed? Now this most perfect plan and work of God, given to humanity to ennoble it and morally regenerate it, brazens it before the hysterical and curious eyes of the multitude looking on in a court of law, while she unfolds the films of her seamy life as a bondswoman or married adventuress, and judge and jury acquit her of the heinous crime laid at her door out of chivalry for woman—and the splendid gown and white-plumed hat which she wears.

True chivalry lifts woman up, and in lifting her up elevates man also to a higher and nobler place. False chivalry, as we see it to-day, drags woman down and thereby debases life, society and civilization. Woman, by her nature, reigns nearer the angels than man, but if this false chivalry obtains—and it is obtaining to-day—we shall have to amend the above and say that now woman reigns nearer the angels—that is, those that fell from light and are captained by the prince of darkness.—The New World (Catholic), August 17.

THINKS SUFFRAGE CRIME OF CENTURY.

"The Protest" is in receipt of the following from a resident of Colorado:

"Please find enclosed check for one year's subscription. This I am glad to do and it may be a surprise to you to get this from Colorado, the supposed home of suffrage and where suffrage is said to have done so much good. This could be proven untrue, did man dare to tell the truth. I have lived in Colorado for seventeen years and for some time was in favor of suffrage, but I have changed my mind in the light of what I have seen here. I believe it to be the crime of the present century and am fighting it with the same vim and vigor that I am fighting the liquor evil. I do not feel that I am fighting woman, but am fighting for them and for their homes, and consequently for the life of our great and glorious nation. I fully believe that were the question of suffrage submitted to-day to the woman vote in this State, suffrage would be defeated by the women who love their homes and want to remain women, to be respected, not feared."

"THE WOMAN'S PROTEST."

By Miss Verna Witherell in Excelsior Springs (Mo.) Daily Call.

The "Call" is in receipt of Vol. 1, No. 1, of a new magazine, published by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. It is full of pithy anti-suffrage reading, presenting logical reasons why the association is in existence and its beliefs.

With the present suffrage struggle that is on in Kansas is coming a rising interest among the women of Missouri in this momentous question. Club women of this State are talking equal suffrage and school children are debating upon the subject.

There is a vast amount of philanthropic work in this country that can be better done by women than men, yet which does not require political "rights." There is never a governmental body of men who are not ready and anxious to know in detail the conditions which need attention in every community and to take steps for their control. For the women who tend toward this work the field is limitless, yet there are thousands of women in the homes of this country who have in their own circle all the interests to which they can give proper attention. A hand in government would be only an added duty, which would not always be welcome.

"Votes for women" in Colorado has not resulted in any noticeable improvement in social conditions, and it has brought into the foreground numbers of masculine women, in whom all gentleness and womanliness is dead or submerged. If the women of the United States do not want to face a prospect of petticoat government and the deterioration of men to a race of weaklings by 1932, it is time for them to cease this struggle for the ballot.

Unjust as Kipling's recent poem may be, it yet remains a fact that the men who give way to the onslaught of women suffragists lack the stamina which has made men the protectors of our race.

"WHY I AM NOT A SUFFRAGETTE."

Oregon Woman Gives Reasons for Opposing the Suffrage Cause.

To the Editor of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST:

May I tell you why I am not a suffragist, as my reasons may interest some of your readers?

When a young girl, while on a visit to my grandmother, she gave me permission to go into her old library and choose any book that I desired as my own. I found the following quotation in one and chose that, and it has lived with me down to this time:

"Woman, in her office, holds the key of the soul;
She it is who stamps the coin of character,
And makes the being, who would be a savage,
But for her gentle care,
A Christian man."

From its standpoint I have watched the world and I find that it moves from the family out. I take its meaning literally, "Woman, in her office," now.

A prominent suffragette said in my presence the other day that her ten-year-old boy was simply running wild, while she was trying to help the "suffrage and temperance causes along," and that she didn't know that she could ever do anything with him again.

I met a child about five years old, crying in the streets, one cold Winter evening; I stopped to speak to him and found his little hands almost frozen; as I warmed them in my own I said, calling him by name, "Why don't you go home?" His plaintive reply was, with a sob, "There's nobody there." This child's mother is one of our most prominent suffragettes, but she has always preferred a business life to holding "the key to the soul." Now, I know there was a paid housekeeper in that home, but to the child that was "nobody."

O woman, don't you see that while fighting for your imaginary "rights" you are losing your rights over your child's soul? 'Tis plain talk, I know, but is it not true? Can you ever win back what is being lost in your child now? Think of this.

Will it pay, this struggle? Every moment you spend in trying to win your political rights you are forfeiting a right over your home—are jeopardizing the home of the future. You are building souls to make factions in the home—discordance. A man cannot cope with business matters and affairs of the world generally and go home sweet-tempered and calm, and bear the petty annoyances and grievances of the family. Can a woman do better? And with her "rights" will come the right and duty to work in the treadmill of business life, to be prominent in the political arena, to take her place by the side of the men—in fact, to lead the men; otherwise, how can she change politics by the suffrage route? And then—"God bless our homes." I am a business woman and know whereof I speak.

One of my dearest friends, whose son was causing her considerable anxiety, surprised me almost beyond expression by saying, "I cannot live with my husband any longer; we will have to have a divorce." I said, "Why?" Her reply was that he blamed her entirely for the trouble the boy was making, and for the misdemeanors of the other children, etc. At the risk of incurring her everlasting displeasure, I said, "My dear friend, you are to blame; for while John is one of the best men I know, and among the brightest, brainiest and most capable, still even he is not big enough and strong enough to do all that he does in the business world and also to do the governing in the home. That is what he chose you for, out of all the women of his acquaintance, and if you have failed, don't blame him." Being a sensible woman, she went home, confessed her fault, and I believe now they are happy and proud of each other.

Remember this: You cannot have outside influences and run a home in its true sense; diversion, of course, we must all have, but not what you call your outside "duties." If you have a home your duty is to that home. If you do not expect to make that your duty, then never have a home. Let me whisper a secret: We know that a mere man could not run a home, even if he had nothing else to do; he isn't built that way. That is woman's prerogative. A woman can do all a man can and that much more, but even she cannot do it all at once.

The men of the land confess they are giving the ballot to women for purely selfish reasons, in order that they may help them untangle the mess into which they have gotten themselves in the political world; and will the women respond? Will they be equal to these expectations? Yes, but not in the way mapped out for them by the voters. If the men have failed, why should the delicate woman think she should succeed on those same lines? Her lines are higher, nobler. "Woman, in her office, holds the key of the soul"—that is the key of her success.

Ashland, Oregon. Elizabeth Yockey.

Third Sex Serves Neither Man Nor God.

Some of our contemporaries think the New World is severe on the suffragettes. We are severe on anything that detracts from true womanhood, it matters not what name it takes. Woman is God's noblest work, and we do not desire to see this work marred and debased by the "prentice hands" of a third sex who serve neither earth nor heaven.—The New World.

VOTES FOR WOMEN.

By Mrs. Benjamin Nicoll.

At a recent suffragist meeting two speakers, in contending for "Votes for Women," pleaded:

1st. That as this is a Democracy each class and each individual should be represented, and

2d. In drawing some inferences from the Triangle fire, that, had women been enfranchised at the time the fire-chief and fire department were elected, they, having much more fear of fire than men, would have secured a more efficient and capable fire department and better enforced rules—that men were indifferent to women's risks.

"HOW MUCH OF THE SUFFRAGISTS' PROPAGANDA CONSISTS IN THE WORDS 'WOULD HAVE!'"

It might be pertinent to ask of the first speaker whether each person must do each thing in order to be "represented" in it? Must we each be the doctor, and the type-setter, and the mother of the family? Does not civilization rather tend to specialization, allowing each to do well that which each one is best adapted for? Is not the plan of every one's doing all rather a return to the condition of primeval man, when male and female alike fought and snarled and hunted in the jungle? Do we want, even approximately, to go back to anything like that?

The Triangle fire was a sad example of human selfishness, and good laws not enforced, and how one wishes that our suffrage friends would spend their splendid energy in supervising the carrying out of such laws as we already have, before appealing for larger power and responsibility! There seems to be enough even now for women to do, and to do without the vote, work such as Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell did, and which Mrs. Isaac Rice, with her "Safe and Sane Fourth" celebration, is doing to-day.

Were any of our suffragists caught, as was the writer, in that saddest of funeral processions, the Triangle Memorial Parade, and obliged to wait while dozen after dozen of those pale and sad-faced mourners filed by, **hundreds of men among them,** who had closed the shops and the factories, and come to protest against the slaughter of their sweethearts and their wives? Does any sane woman really think that those men wanted the flames to destroy all that made home dearest to many of them? Or that indifference to the women of their own class played any really serious part in the horrors of that terrible fire?

Truly, civil war is dreadful enough, but what shall we say to those people who endeavor to set **men** and **women** in class hatred against each other?

When last Summer's disgraceful charter was almost forced upon New York City, there was one group only of respectable citizens—the women board of school teachers—who voted as a class for its adoption, and this because of the one clause advocating equal pay for equal work for both women and men. (This fact was vouched for to the writer by one protesting teacher.) In other words, this intelligent and respectable set of women were willing to accept, "to swallow," that whole abominable charter because of one clause which seemed to offer benefit to themselves.

What shall we say—in view of this—of the "disinterested woman vote," of which we hear so much?

Happily the charter did not go through, or these poor ladies would have discovered to their chagrin that if man can be had as cheaply as woman, in many of the upper grades they are greatly preferred; we fear that their selfishness would in many cases have cost them their "job" altogether, but of that they probably did not think. So few of even the large army of business and wage-earning women go into these occupations as a life work; most of them expect to marry and then give the whole thing up. Might not some of the suffrage energy be more wisely expended in helping any reasonable demands of the labor unions, and by increasing good conditions for the husbands and fathers, keep more women from the need of industrial competition, and if it be claimed that more leisure and more pay means more drink for the man (which the writer does not believe) are there not athletics and social clubs, and museums and parks, all of which, more and more popularized, might perhaps do as much to elevate the community as the very problematical woman's vote?

WHY I BECAME A SUFFRAGETTE.

By Cicely Hamilton in London Daily Mail.

Like many of us who profess the faith of feminism, I suppose that I was always a feminist in embryo—by temperament if not by conviction. Certainly I cannot look back upon the day when the preferential treatment and superior prospects of the human boy, the artificial limitation of the energies of the average human girl, did not fill me with envy and resentment. I remember that envy and resentment flaring up into impotent fury when, at the age of six or seven or so, I was forbidden a questionable form of amusement—something rough and unladylike, no doubt—on the ground that I had been born a girl; my cousin, on the ground that he had been born a boy, being allowed to take part in the unseemly sport. And that night, sleepless from the sense of injustice, I lay and wrestled with Heaven in reproach that I had been sent into the world woman instead of man. . . .

Later, as I grew older, there came the sense—the very galling sense—that what people liked in me was not what I liked and believed to be highest in myself; that what they wanted me to be was not what I wished to become; that the world was trying to twist me as it did not twist my brother, and judging me by a standard to which I did not wish to conform. (That, of course, is an experience that comes to all of us, men as well as women; but it comes more consistently and forcibly to women than to men.) I objected to being judged by the virtues I did not possess or desire; I objected—bitterly—to having to shape myself to a certain pattern of womanfulness which stirred within me no particular warmth of admiration. Long before I was a woman grown I knew that it was expected of me that I should be attractive and wish to be attractive; and—such is the force of hint and silent precept and pressure of example and opinion—long before I was a woman grown I found myself trying to make of myself what is termed an attractive personality. I never had any genuine liking for the job; I believe I can put my hand on my heart and say that, save where a very few persons are concerned, it has never much mattered to me whether I was an attractive personality or not. Yet all the same—in obedience to hint and silent precept and the pressure of example and opinion—I made for some years conscientious attempts to be charming; upon which I now look back with regret for squandered time and no little amusement combined with it.

DOMESTICITY AND WEDLOCK.

I do not exactly know how and when the whole business first struck me as ridiculous—the perennial persevering endeavor of many and various women to mold themselves to the same pattern (often against the grain) and to attain to the same end: domesticity and marriage. But I can look back upon a time when the boring and ridiculous nature of the process, so far as I was concerned, had dawned upon me definitely, and I had decided that, so far as I was concerned, it was quite unnecessary to continue it.

Following the inquiry as to whether a good many of us were not wasting our best energies along the line of most resistance; and the conclusion that there were frequent exceptions to the rule that a woman found happiness only in the service of husband and of child—in short, I began to ask myself how far I and the other women of my acquaintance were really and honestly in want of the things that we had been told from our childhood were what we ought to want. And I discovered not only that some of us, even while striving to attain them with all our might, were not at all in need of them, but that a considerable number of us had not the faintest idea of what we really did want, coming eventually to the conclusion that we, who were women, were creatures not of one possibility but of many, and that the best and most necessary thing for us to do was to find out as speedily as might be what those possibilities were.

Long before I had arrived at this conclusion I had, like every woman who works for her bread, got rid of the delusion that women in the mass were supported by men in the mass—as an act of amiability and protection. At one time of my life I knew few women who did not work for a wage, and those few, for the most part, differed from their wage-earning sisters only in this—that they toiled without monetary guerdon. Thus, long before I had learned to dispute, in so many words, the proposition that woman's place is the home, I knew that women situated as I was could not stay at home unless they wished to starve; the said knowledge leaving me with small respect for venerable sentiment, and helping, in no small degree, to develop me from a mere rebel, conscious only of personal misfit in the scheme of things, to a full-fledged feminist—that is to say, to a woman who understood that her sense of misfit and restiveness was not peculiar to herself but the characteristic of a repressed and restive class.

MAN MORE ADVANCED.

I may add—though I be not believed—that my feminist faith is not, and never has been, based upon a bleief in the essential superiority of the human woman over the human man. On the contrary, I believe that the male of the human species is, take him all in all, a more advanced, competent and capable creature than his female relative. If it were not so, I should not see the force of demanding for his female relative the freedom of opportunity, which, to a great extent, has made him what he is, while as regards the evils to be remedied, the wrongs to be redressed by means of triumphant feminism, I do not confine my sympathy to the evils endured and the wrongs suffered by women as the result of their present subjection. On the contrary again, since I can declare, in all honor and honesty, that I am often moved to involuntary pity by the spectacle of the well-intentioned male staggering through life under the deadly burden which presses on his back—the burden of incompetent and helpless feminity. True though it be that his own hands, prompted by his own owlishness, have placed the burden there, he is none the less an object of sympathy! And though he resents (as he generally does) any and every attempt to induce his burden to slip down from his shoulders and stand on her own two feet, we, who wish him well, shall none the less persevere in our charitable endeavors to save him from the consequences of his own mistakes!

"WHY I AM AN ANTI-SUFFRAGIST."

By an American Woman.

To the Editor of the London Daily Mail:

Sir—I read with some wonderment why certain ladies became suffragists, and as usual "came out at the same door wherein I went," somewhat puzzled as to how the ballot is to alter inherent differences.

May I give a few reasons why I became an anti-suffragist? In the first place I never suffered from any of the restraints of which women so commonly complain. I was treated from my earliest youth as the mental equal of my brothers, and marriage was never held up to me as the only possible life for a woman. Indeed, the burdens of a woman's life took me somewhat by surprise and found me unprepared. I am not aware that the desire to attract played any great part in my fate, nor that the ballot could have prevented my acceptance of the responsibilities that fell to me. They seem, indeed, to be outside the realm of politics and the same under all systems of government.

I became an anti-suffragist because I came to realize that woman's work in the world was of such a nature that it required a conservation of vital force. Exceptions do not alter this great fact.

I became an anti-suffragist also because I realized that no matter what majority of votes women put in the ballot box it rested with men to enforce the laws and to carry our governmental policies. If every woman in England (and there are, I believe, one million more women than men) were in favor of maintaining the Mediterranean fleet, it would still depend on the men to give effect to such a policy. The time will never come when this will be otherwise.

I became an anti-suffragist because I believe true patriotism for women calls for another and different sacrifice from what is asked of men, and, being patriotic, I wish to pay my share.

I became an anti-suffragist because I think it absurdly illogical to demand equality and privilege in the same breath, and, knowing no woman who is ready honestly to relinquish the privilege, I accept the inequality so far as it means that I accept the fact that women are physically incapable of doing men's work and their own too. I cannot believe that the nation can dispense with women's work.

I became an anti-suffragist because, having reached this point, I saw that as women we should shortly be represented by those who had not the complete experience of life necessary to make them wise. I feared the loss of what I consider necessary protection through an assumption of prowess in exceptional women not common to all our sex. I saw that men were less likely to overlook physical differences than were independent and emancipated women. I saw that these had a terrible scorn of the bearer of burdens which foretold hard times ahead for many wives and mothers who cling to their traditional duties. I felt that these wives and mothers would find, perhaps, the old customary support and dower dearer than equality and a vote. I felt that they might even come to suffer a greater inequality by the side of their advanced sisters.

I became an anti-suffragist because I came to believe that suffrage is a reform against nature and not the result of an inner need. The women who want to vote have no idea why they want to vote. Their writings show this. Votes will not alter the conditions they describe, which are in no way related to voting. The Mormon women of Utah have the vote and use it for their husbands—the more wives the more votes. The negroes of the Southern States have votes and are in a majority in many States, but they are not permitted to use them at all. Yet the women of Kentucky with no votes defeated a popular candidate for Congress on moral grounds.

What indeed have voteless women not accomplished? A study of the civic work of the women's clubs in America will answer this question. We all know what individual women do and what power is theirs. I am an anti-suffragist because I do not believe in hampering these well-organized and intelligent women with the great ignorant female vote—not to speak of the corrupt and corrupting influence of sex where power and money are the prizes to be gained. I speak from the American standpoint. Our alien population is ill-adjusted, ignorant and often unpatriotic.

I am an anti-suffragist because I believe no nation is strong whose women are not conservative.

J. T. W.

SUFFRAGE BEATEN IN OHIO.

The Woman Suffrage Amendment to the Ohio State Constitution was defeated at the polls on September 3rd, by an overwhelming majority. A full report of the campaign against suffrage in Ohio will be presented in the next issue of *The Woman's Protest.*

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The desire and effort of the women who are opposing woman suffrage are for the fullest development and widest usefulness of women, and they believe that such high ends are not to be reached through their enfranchisement, but rather through an extension of such civic endeavor as has already characterized their public-spirited work. They oppose by every intelligent and consistent means the mischievous and reactionary efforts of the woman suffrage movement in the different States.

Suffrage is not a question of equality, of intellect or superiority of righteousness, but an adjustment of the work of the State, to the limitations and capacities of both men and women. Duplication is always weakness, and to do our part must necessarily mean to leave men free to do theirs, while we, with every highest aspiration, work to accomplish by non-partizan, politically untrammeled methods such work as belongs by right to us.

* * *

An appeal is made by Mrs. Humphrey Ward to women to support the Local Government Advancement Committee, which has for its object the promotion of the work of women in local government affairs.

"If only," she says, "we realized how much special work for women and children is crying out to be done by women and how few hands there are to do it, we should hear less about the claims to the parliamentary vote until at least this urgent need has been met and women had shown themselves willing to give the nation the help which it is now asking at their hands."

* * *

Chicago, August 16.—Signatures of registered voters attached to equal-suffrage petitions are worth one cent each in Illinois. This price will hold until 20,000 more names are procured. The following advertisements, which Mrs. Catherine Waugh McCulloch, an Evanston suffragist, sent out explained the market value of the signatures:

"HELP WANTED—I will pay for services in obtaining genuine signatures of registered Illinois voters on our woman suffrage public policy petition, at the rate of $1 a hundred signatures until twenty thousand additional signatures are obtained, prior to September 1, 1912."

A petition of one hundred thousand signatures will be required before the question may be submitted to a vote at the general election next November.

The New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

(FOUNDED 1895)

PAMPHLETS.

Woman and the Law — *By Francis M. Scott*

Address Before Constitutional Convention, 1894 — *By Hon. Elihu Root*

First Address Before the New York Legislature, 1895 — *By Mrs. Francis M. Scott*

The Problem of Woman Suffrage — *By Adeline Knapp*

Woman's Rights in America — *By Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin*

A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question — *By Miss Emily P. Bissell*

Wages and the Ballot — *By Mary Dean Adams*

Should We Ask for the Suffrage? — *By Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*

How Women Can Best Serve the State — *By Mrs. Barclay Hazard*

The Blank Cartridge Ballot — *By Rossiter Johnson*

Taxation and Suffrage — *By Frederick Dwight*

Real Opponents to the Suffrage Movement — *By Edward W. Bok*

The Relation of the Sexes to Government — *By Prof. Edward D. Cope*

Do Working Women Need the Ballot? — *By Adeline Knapp*

Woman's Progress Versus Woman Suffrage — *By Helen Kendrick Johnson*

What Women Have Actually Done Where they Vote — *By Richard Barry*

Woman's Relation to Government — *By Mrs. William Forse Scott*

The Inexpediency of Granting Suffrage to American Women — *By Miss Alice Hill Chittenden*

The Legal Status of Women — *By Mrs. Francis M. Scott*

Feminism — *By Prof. Dr. Melchior Palagyi*

Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — *By Miss Minnie Bronson*

Woman Suffrage in Finland

New Zealand and Australia from an Anti-Suffrage Point of View

The Voice of the People

Suffragists Desert Philanthropy

Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law.

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 29 West 39th Street, New York City, Engineering Societies Building.

Complete set 50 cts. **Single copies 5 cts.**

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING:

On Suffrage, (.05) — *G. K. Chesterton*

Votes for Women (.10) — *Frederic Harrison*

The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Eliot Seawell*

Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)

Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*

Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

Anti-Suffrage Calendar for 1911, with many interesting quotations. These can be obtained by applying to the Woman's Protest.

We recommend to our readers the new Monthly, THE COMMON CAUSE, which is opposed to Socialism. Subscription $2.00. Office, 154 East 23rd Street. Also, THE HOME DEFENDER, Hoquim, Wash.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association opposed to the further extension of suffrage to women:

Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*

Of What Benefit to Woman?

Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*

Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*

Argument Before Committee — *Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells*

Municipal Suffrage for Women. Why? — *Frank Foxcroft*

Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*

The Wage-earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*

Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and Not to Men

Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage

In Opposition to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (a List of Massachusetts Men)

Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association

KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615

687 Boylston Street, - - - - BOSTON, MASS.

The Woman's Protest

.....1912

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
29 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....years subscription to **The Woman's Protest.**

Name.....

Street.....

City.....*State*.....

Subscription Rate $1.00 a year **Make checks payable to The Woman's Protest**

"Recollections of Elizabeth Benton Fremont,"

Daughter of the "Pathfinder," Genl. John C. Fremont.

A Story of Pioneer Days in the Southwest
By I. T. MARTIN.

By Mail Prepaid, $1.25.

Address I. T. MARTIN,
2979 Decatur Ave., New York City.

The Newest Woman.

V.—AND THE NEWEST MORALITY.

BY HAROLD OWEN.

At the present moment the Royal Commission on the Divorce Laws is engaged in the task of drawing up its report. Its task is to consider how to widen the emergency exit of marriage, and yet leave it a turnstile—assuming that it considers it desirable to increase the facilities for divorce at all.

Mrs. Fawcett gave evidence before the Commission, and pleaded for the equality of the sexes in divorce law; but I do not remember that any more advanced member of the Feminist army appeared as a witness. And that is a pity, for the views of advanced Feminism on the whole problem would have interested, and perhaps shocked, the Commission. Nevertheless, we are in a position to know what Feminists would have had to say to a body that is, as they think, gingerly tackling a problem which Feminism is ready to solve on its own lines. And those lines, it is hardly necessary to say, diverge very considerably from our current system of morality.

FREER LOVE AND HIGHER LIFE.

It is, indeed, impossible that the wholesale revolution in the economic status of women which Feminism contemplates could be carried through, or even carried past its initial stages, without a corresponding revolution in our system of morals. When "another eight million women" are entering the industrial market alone to earn a livelihood, so that they may be independent of wife maintenance, a good many things are likely to happen besides a very keen economic rivalry with male wage-earners. And one of the first consequences of a system of indiscriminate industrialism of men and women would be, it hardly needs saying, that the marriage rate as well as the birth rate would come down with a rush, and the very institution of marriage would be undermined to its foundations. For though one section of Feminists are preoccupied with the ideal of showing man how unnecessary he is to woman's existence, another section is just now engaged in idealizing erotic impulses, and spiritualizing sexual emotion, and trying to reconcile two apparently incompatible things—freer love and the higher life.

Their philosophy and their new morality are, of course, honestly inspired by the highest motives, and it is the conclusions rather than the aims that must be criticized by those who are outraged by their doctrines. But, at any rate, Feminism does not, as a whole, contemplate a race of "newest woman" who will be sour vestals. And as the "eight million more women" will be too busy earning weekly wages to get married, and too self-dependent to give up work and wages for husbands and babies, and as they will, moreover, be working primarily to free themselves from the parasitical condition of "'kept' wives," it is pretty clear that the higher life of freer love will have to be lived rather outside than within the bonds of holy matrimony.

But Feminism has not overlooked that consequence. You cannot catch the Feminist napping like that. It is useless to say to the Feminist, in wide-eyed remonstrance: "But, my dear young lady, the state of society which you contemplate would just about abolish marriage altogether!" For the young lady would merely think you were horribly behind the times, and as mentally frumpish as she thinks the elementary suffragist who says that all women want is just a teeny-weeny little vote, or as she thinks the "practical politician" who declares: "All we ask is that the custodian of that cupboard shall have a weapon with which to defend her children's bread!" Those ideas, the Feminist thinks, belong "to the year '1.'" For Feminism has already provided for that development, and has discounted your discovery in advance; and the Feminist is quite prepared to see our present system of marriage modified so as to accommodate itself to the new era. Indeed, she is even prepared to urge the modification for its own sake, and, apart from its inevitability, on the highest ethical principles.

THE NEW MORALITY.

Feminism, in short, has a new morality, and it is designed to complete the enfranchisement of women over the whole area of their existence—first politically, then economically, and then ethically. Moreover, the new morality is a reasoned creed. Courageous to the last, feminism shirks nothing. Its spirit is indomitable, and seems to be inspired by all those crying facts which, even before it has started on its journey, point to the extreme probability that when women begin universally to seek their economic independence in competition with man, they will become the doomed hewers of wood and the drudges of industrialism.

But feminism is undaunted. It sees that the woman's movement must either go forward to the goal it has perceived, or move backward to the status quo and admit that it ought never to have begun to move at all. So it faces facts with a high resolve. Is the "economic independence of woman" a mere phrase or a definite aim? A definite aim, is the answer. Very well, then eight million more women must enter the field of industrialism alone to realize that aim. Is the position of the parasitical wife "responsible for most of the social ills from which we suffer"? Then the aim of Feminism is to teach all women that they must look upon the position of the kept wife as on no higher ethical plane than that of the kept mistress. Does a woman need children more than a man, and are they more intimately hers than his? Then in the name of her equality, let her choose the father of them as she likes, and take upon herself the burden of sustaining her own offspring.

But these, it will be said, are simply revolutionary thoughts in the ethical sphere. So they are, but the point is that Feminism is engaged in discussing them.

THE TENETS OF FEMINISM.

"We take all labor for our province," says another. "The law has nothing to do fruit in the garden of knowledge that we will not eat," says another Feminist. "I can find nothing but cant and humbug in the general idealization of motherhood," says another. "The law has nothing to do with regulating the loves of men and women—it can bid passion neither come nor go," says a fourth; and, again, "Monogamy is immoral and a grossly unfair monopoly." "The immediate tendency of a noisy minority," says a fifth, discussing the Divorce Law Commission, "is to insist on monogamy at all costs; but that cannot last very long." "If prurience has slain its thousands," says "A Spinster," "chastity has slain its tens of thousands." "Nothing is more remarkable in the woman's movement," says another, "than the fact that as the stream of it broadens, what was originally a demand for a better education or for a share in political responsibility has become a criticism of the very principles on which society is founded."

And that is the simple truth. And as I am fulfilling merely an informative function in these articles, I may leave the matter there. For I am only concerned to point out that it is doing a great injustice to the woman's movement to suppose that it is so sterile in spirit as to aim merely to acquire a political instrument without having looked ahead to see what shall be done with it. I need not describe the instrument. Most people call it the vote. But those who have seen the myrmidons of a house-breaking firm precariously at work on a wall may give it another name altogether.

The Feminist, rushing into a verbal opening, may say, "That is just it! Society is a dilapidated building, and we are going to raze the rotten edifice to the ground, and build our glorious temple on its ruins!" But others besides Feminists live in that building, and though we can't help matters if it crumbles about our heads of its own accord, we are hardly likely to remain passive and complacent observers while a few energetic ladies wreck and dismantle it before our eyes. Even the house demolishers wait for their instructions before they start work.